



PATENT
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: February 9, 2004

Serial No.: 09/764,564

Filing Date: January 17, 2001

Applicant: VERMEIRE, et al.

Title: Method of Accessing Data and Logic on Existing Systems
through Dynamic Construction of Software Components

Examiner: Wood, William H.

Art Unit: 2124

Telephone: (703) 305-3303

Facsimile: (703) 746-7239

#6/a
O. Co. H.
2/19/04
RECEIVED

FEB 13 2004

Technology Center 2100

Commissioner for Patents
Post Office Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.10, with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as Express Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop: Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 by

Signature: *B P S*

Date: *2/9/04*

Express Mail No.: EV 000481435 US

AMENDMENT

This Paper responds to the communication from the Examiner mailed October 8, 2003. Please enter the following Amendment to the above-identified Application.

02/19/2004 Sir: Reexamination and reconsideration of the Application is respectfully requested.

01 FC:1251

110.00 DR

The Applicant herewith petitions the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks to extend the time for reply to the Office Action dated October 8, 2003 for one (1) month(s) from January 8, 2004 to February 9, 2004. Please charge payment of the extension fee to deposit account number 500-354.

The Applicant's response to the Office Action mailed October 8, 2003, with a one month extension was due on or before Sunday February 8, 2004 to avoid additional

INVENTOR: VERMEIRE, et al.
Serial No. 09/974,564

extension fees. As this date was a Sunday and the Office was closed, the applicant believes this response to be timely filed by mailing on Monday February 9, 2004 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a) and the payment of a one month extension fee.

Issues Raised in the Office Action

Claims 1 through 7 are currently pending in the instant application. In the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 5-7 were rejected and claim 4 objected to as depending from a rejected base claim. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirao et al. (U.S. 6,442,749) in view of Humpleman et al. (U.S. 6,546,419) and in further view of Purple (U.S. 6,252,587). In addition claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite.

The Applicant offers the following amendment and remarks in response and by which, the Applicant believes, allowable subject matter is achieved.